

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

(Caption of Case)

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T  
Southeast d/b/a AT&T South Carolina, Complainant,  
Petitioner v. Affordable Phone Services, Inc. d/b/a  
High Tech Communications, Defendant/Respondent

BEFORE THE  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COVER SHEET

DOCKET  
NUMBER: 2010 - 14 - C

(Please type or print)

Submitted by: John J. Pringle, Jr.

SC Bar Number: 11208

Telephone: 803-343-1270

Fax: 803-799-8479

Address: Ellis, Lawhorne & Sims, PA

Other:

PO Box 2285

Columbia SC 29202

Email: jpringle@ellislawhorne.com

NOTE: The cover sheet and information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form is required for use by the Public Service Commission of South Carolina for the purpose of docketing and must be filled out completely.

DOCKETING INFORMATION (Check all that apply)

☐ Emergency Relief demanded in petition

☐ Request for item to be placed on Commission's Agenda expeditiously

☐ Other:

INDUSTRY (Check one)	NATURE OF ACTION (Check all that apply)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Electric	<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavit	<input type="checkbox"/> Letter	<input type="checkbox"/> Request	
<input type="checkbox"/> Electric/Gas	<input type="checkbox"/> Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> Memorandum	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Certification	
<input type="checkbox"/> Electric/Telecommunications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Answer	<input type="checkbox"/> Motion	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Investigation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Electric/Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Appellate Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Objection	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Agreement	
<input type="checkbox"/> Electric/Water/Telecom.	<input type="checkbox"/> Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Amendment	
<input type="checkbox"/> Electric/Water/Sewer	<input type="checkbox"/> Brief	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition for Reconsideration	<input type="checkbox"/> Reservation Letter	
<input type="checkbox"/> Gas	<input type="checkbox"/> Certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition for Rulemaking	<input type="checkbox"/> Response	
<input type="checkbox"/> Railroad	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition for Rule to Show Cause	<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Discovery	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer	<input type="checkbox"/> Complaint	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Intervene	<input type="checkbox"/> Return to Petition	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telecommunications	<input type="checkbox"/> Consent Order	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Intervene Out of Time	<input type="checkbox"/> Stipulation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Discovery	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefiled Testimony	<input type="checkbox"/> Subpoena	
<input type="checkbox"/> Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit	<input type="checkbox"/> Promotion	<input type="checkbox"/> Tariff	
<input type="checkbox"/> Water/Sewer	<input type="checkbox"/> Expedited Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Order	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Matter	<input type="checkbox"/> Interconnection Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> Protest		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Interconnection Amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> Publisher's Affidavit		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Late-Filed Exhibit	<input type="checkbox"/> Report		

Print Form

Reset Form

# ELLIS:LAWHORNE

John J. Pringle, Jr.  
Direct dial: 803/343-1270  
[jpringle@ellislawhorne.com](mailto:jpringle@ellislawhorne.com)

February 25, 2010

**FILED ELECTRONICALLY**

The Honorable Jocelyn G. Boyd  
Clerk

**South Carolina Public Service Commission**

PO Drawer 11649  
Columbia SC 29211

RE: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a  
AT&T South Carolina, Complainant/Petitioner v. Affordable Phone  
Services, Inc. d/b/a High Tech Communications, Defendant/Respondent  
**Docket No. 2010-14-C, Our File No. 893-11711**


Dear Jocelyn:

Enclosed is the **Answer and Counterclaims** filed on behalf of Affordable Phone  
Services, Inc. d/b/a High Tech Communications in the above-referenced docket.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to  
contact me.

With kind regards, I am

Yours truly,



John J. Pringle, Jr.

JJP/cr

Enclosure

cc: C. Lessie Hammonds, Esquire (via electronic mail service)  
Patrick W. Turner (via electronic mail service)  
Henry M. Walker, Esquire (via electronic mail service)  
Christopher Malish (via electronic mail service)  
Gordon D. Polozola, Esquire (via electronic mail service)  
Paul F. Guarisco, Esquire (via electronic mail service)  
Mr. Jim R. Dry (via electronic mail service)

**BEFORE THE  
SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. )	
d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a )	
AT&T South Carolina, )	
Complainant/Petitioner v. )	Docket No. 2010-14-C
Affordable Phone Services, Inc., )	
d/b/a High Tech Communications )	
Defendant/Respondent )	

**ANSWER AND COUNTER-CLAIMS OF AFFORDABLE PHONE SERVICES, INC.  
D/B/A HIGH TECH COMMUNICATIONS.**

Affordable Phone Services, Inc. d/b/a High Tech Communications. ("Affordable" or "Respondent") responds to the Complaint filed by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T South Carolina ("AT&T") concerning a billing dispute between the parties.

**NARRATIVE SUMMARY**

Affordable is a local exchange telephone company providing service to approximately 8,200 subscribers in South Carolina, nearly all of whom are low income, residential customers. Affordable resells the services of AT&T. As a reseller, Affordable is entitled under federal law to receive from AT&T the same "cash back" credits and promotional discounts that AT&T gives to its own retail customers. Those credits and discount are usually sufficient to offset, in large part, Affordable's monthly bills from AT&T.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> AT&T's Complaint implies that since Affordable pays little or nothing to AT&T each month for the purchase of wholesale services, the Respondent must be behind on its bills. That implication is incorrect. Affordable is currently up-to-date on its bills and regularly pays AT&T all amount owed, less the promotional discounts and rebates owed by AT&T to Affordable.

Like a grocery shopper with a pocket full of coupons, Affordable primarily purchases AT&T services which qualify for rebates and discounts. The rebates are often larger than the wholesale price of the service. Just as a shopper with coupons may purchase a cart full of goods for only a few dollars, the Respondent may purchase wholesale services at very little net cost. This litigation is not about whether Affordable pays its bills, but about the  
*(footnote continued on following page ...)*

AT&T is not entitled to any relief sought in its Complaint. To the contrary, AT&T owes Affordable a substantial amount of money in unpaid -- or underpaid -- rebates and discounts which AT&T offers its own retail customers but refuses to pay its wholesale customers in violation of federal law and the parties' interconnection agreement.

Under the Federal Telecommunications Act and the rules and orders of the Federal Communications Commission, AT&T is required to offer its services for resale (1) "subject to the same conditions" that AT&T offers its own end users and at (2) "the rate for the telecommunications service less avoided retail costs." 47 CFR §51.603(b) and 47 CFR §51.607. Other than in limited circumstances not applicable here, AT&T cannot impose any restrictions on the resale of its services unless AT&T "proves to the state commission that the restriction is reasonable and non-discriminatory." 47 CFR §51.613.

For example, when AT&T offers new customers a rebate of "\$50 cash back" for subscribing to residential telephone, AT&T must make the same offer available to resellers. In other words, the reseller will still pay AT&T the normal wholesale rate, that is, the tariffed price less the wholesale discount as determined by the state regulators. The reseller is also, however, entitled to purchase this service "under the same conditions" as an AT&T retail customer, that is, with a rebate of "\$50 cash back."

---

*(... footnote continued from previous page)*

property amount of those bills and whether AT&T is giving Affordable the full amount of the discounts and rebates to which a reseller is entitled under federal law.

There have also been, and continue to be, disagreements between the parties over the time it takes AT&T to calculate the rebates and discounts and credit them to the reseller's account. AT&T has, at various times, been months behind while many resellers, including Affordable, typically deduct the amounts owed by AT&T when paying their monthly bills. Although AT&T has worked on reducing these delays, operational problems remain a continuing source of disputes between the parties. These disputes are not before the Commission at this time.

In this example, the rebate offer does not change the competitive balance between the carriers. On the one hand, AT&T earns exactly the same margin – the tariffed rate less the wholesale discount – whether or not AT&T offers new customers a rebate. On the other hand, Affordable receives exactly the same benefit that it normally receives from the avoided cost discount – the tariffed rate less the wholesale discount – and the same \$50 rebate that AT&T offers new retail customers. Like AT&T, Affordable is no better or worse off than Affordable would be if AT&T was not offering the \$50 rebate. Neither carrier gains a competitive advantage or a financial windfall as a result of the rebate program.

That is the way the resale obligation is supposed to work. Assuming that the avoided retail costs are calculated correctly, the resale rules preserves competitive neutrality. Neither AT&T nor the reseller gains a competitive advantage whether a service is sold at retail or wholesale and neither gains an advantage whether AT&T is selling at the tariffed rate or offering a cash rebate.

But AT&T does not follow the rules. When AT&T offers its retail customers a \$50 rebate, AT&T will not offer the same rebate to a reseller. Instead, AT&T subtracts the wholesale discount from the rebate before giving it to the reseller. If, for example, the wholesale discount is 20%, AT&T will pay the reseller only \$40 instead of \$50, gaining a \$10 windfall – and a competitive advantage – each time a line is sold at wholesale rather than retail.

Here is a simple example, which assumes that the wholesale discount is 20%:

When AT&T sells a residential telephone service for a tariffed rate of \$30 per month, the reseller pays a wholesale rate of \$24 a month for the line (Retail rate less 20%.) If AT&T pays a \$50 rebate in connection with the sale of the line to a new customer, AT&T only gives the reseller a credit of \$40 (\$50 less the 20% wholesale discount). When the first month's credits and payments are balanced, the reseller has a net credit of \$16 (the \$40 credit to the reseller less

the \$24 payment to AT&T). The retail customer, on the other hand, has a net credit of \$20 at the end of the month (the \$50 credit less the \$30 tariffed price). Using AT&T's approach, the "retail" rate is actually \$4 less than the "wholesale" rate- a classic, illegal price squeeze. If, on the other hand, AT&T gave the reseller credit for the full, \$50 rebate, the reseller would have a net credit of \$26 (the \$50 credit to the reseller less the \$24 payment to AT&T) and the net wholesale price would, as it should, be six dollars less than the retail price.

This, then, is the first issue raised in AT&T's Complaint: When AT&T offers its retail customers a cash rebate, what is proper amount of the rebate AT&T must offer to resellers? Respondent's contends AT&T must offer the same cash rebate to a reseller. AT&T contends that it is only required to offer the amount of the rebate minus the wholesale discount. In either case, the reseller is still charged for the line itself at the regular tariffed rate, less the wholesale discount. Under Respondent's approach, the competitive balance reflected in the calculation of the avoided cost discount is preserved whether or not AT&T offers a rebate of \$100, \$50, or any other amount. Under AT&T's approach, AT&T gains a competitive advantage by giving the reseller only a percentage of the rebate. The larger the rebate, the larger the windfall, the larger AT&T's competitive advantage.

The second issue raised in the Complaint is not about calculating the amount of a rebate owed to a reseller but about determining whether a particular AT&T promotion is even subject to the resale requirement.

Since the 2007 decision of the US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in BellSouth v. Sanford, 197 F.3d 663 (4<sup>th</sup> Circuit, 2007), BellSouth (now AT&T) has not disputed that when it offers a cash rebate to attract new retail customers, the company must also offer a rebate – at least of some amount – to resellers serving similarly situated wholesale customers. But when the cash is offered, not to the new user but to an existing AT&T customer as a reward for referring

new business to the company, AT&T argues that this "referral" promotion is not subject to resale and that AT&T owes nothing to a reseller serving similarly situated customers.

The Sanford court held that when AT&T offers cash, gift cards, or other items of value to its retail customers in exchange for the purchase of regulated service, AT&T has, in effect, reduced the price of that service and must offer that same price reduction, along with the value of the avoided cost discount, to resellers. In an apparent attempt to evade the Court's holding, AT&T has decided to offer cash, gift cards, or other items of value to its retail customers in exchange for the purchase of regulated service, *not by the existing customer, but by a new customer who is referred to AT&T by the existing customer*. The rebate, in other words, goes to an existing customer, not for purchasing services himself, but as a reward for persuading someone else to purchase AT&T's telephone service. The impact on AT&T is the same, of course, as if AT&T had paid the new customer directly. In exchange for a payment of, for example, \$50, AT&T has gained a new subscriber. But the impact on a reseller is quite different, according to AT&T. The company contends that this promotion is not subject to resale and refuses to pay anything when an existing customer of an AT&T reseller refers new business to the reseller. The advantage to AT&T is the same whether the referral brings a new retail customer or a new wholesale customer to AT&T. But in the retail market, AT&T pays a fee for getting a new customer, while in the wholesale market, AT&T gets the same new business but pays nothing at all.

This is the second issue raised in the Complaint. Affordable believes it is entitled to resell AT&T's referral promotion and collect a rebate equal to the value of the payment offered by AT&T to its retail customers for referring new business. AT&T contends that it is not required to offer this promotion to resellers and that it owes Affordable nothing for bringing new, wholesale business to AT&T.

Finally, Affordable brings its own counter-claims against AT&T concerning some of AT&T's other restrictions on the resale of regulated services.

- a. AT&T offers to waive the line connection charge for new retail customers and is, therefore, required to offer resellers a waiver of equal value. Instead, AT&T offers resellers only a portion of the value of the waiver of the line connection fee.
- b. AT&T offers retail customers a discount on the purchase of regulated telephone service if the customer purchases a bundle of regulated and non-regulated services. AT&T, however, refuses to offer unbundled telephone service for resale at a comparable discount.
- c. AT&T has recently announced its intention to eliminate almost entirely the cash rebates paid to resellers. For example, AT&T has stated that competitive carriers in South Carolina who resell a "\$50 cash back" promotion are entitled to receive a rebate of only \$4.66. Implementation of this proposal has been enjoined by a Federal District Court in Texas. That decision is now under review by the Fifth Circuit. Oral argument is scheduled for March 1, 2010.

In each case, AT&T has imposed, or tried to impose, a restriction on the resale of its service without first "prov[ing] to the state commission that the restriction is reasonable and non-discriminatory" as AT&T is required to do under the FCC's rules. 47 C.F.R. §51.613(b).

#### **SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO AT&T'S COMPLAINT**

The Section of AT&T South Carolina's Complaint entitled "Background and Summary of Petition" and all included footnotes are AT&T South Carolina's version of the situation and



require no response from Respondent. Unless below Respondent specifically admits any of the matters asserted, those matters are denied.

1. Admitted.

2. Admitted.

3. Admitted. The Respondent is a competitive local exchange carrier certified by the Commission to offer intrastate telecommunications services. The Respondent currently serves approximately 8,200 customers in South Carolina, primarily through the resale of AT&T's services. The address of Respondent's corporate headquarters is 2855 Southeast 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Ocala, Florida 34480.

4. Because of the voluminous Exhibits to AT&T's Complaint, Respondent has not been yet able to review each page of those exhibits and is thus without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Complaint and therefore cannot either admit or deny the same. Thus, such allegations stand denied. However, Respondent also states that it has no reason to dispute AT&T's assertion that the Exhibits are accurate copies of the interconnection agreement between AT&T and the Respondent.

5. Because of the voluminous Exhibits to AT&T's Complaint, Respondent has not been yet able to review each page of those exhibits and is thus without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 5 of the Complaint and therefore cannot either admit or deny the same. Thus, such allegations stand denied. However, Respondent also states that it has no reason to dispute AT&T's assertion that the Exhibits are accurate copies of the interconnection agreement between AT&T and the Respondent.

6. Because of the voluminous Exhibits to AT&T's Complaint, Respondent has not been yet able to review each page of those exhibits and is thus without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Complaint and therefore cannot either admit or deny the same. Thus, such allegations stand denied. However, Respondent also states that it has no reason to dispute AT&T's assertion that the Exhibits are accurate copies of the interconnection agreement between AT&T and the Respondent.

7. Denied.

8. Respondent is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 8 of the Complaint and therefore cannot either admit or deny the same. Thus, such allegations stand denied.

9. Respondent is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Complaint and therefore cannot either admit or deny the same. Thus, such allegations stand denied.

10. Denied.

11. Respondent denies that AT&T is owed an unpaid balance.

12. Admitted.

13. Denied.

14. The language of the Federal Telecommunications Act speaks for itself. Otherwise, this allegation is denied.

15. Denied. Affordable does not claim any credits under this promotion.

16. Denied. Affordable does not claim any credits under this promotion.

17. Denied. Affordable does not claim any credits under this promotion.

18. Admitted.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

19. Respondent asks that Commission to dismiss this Complaint in deference to the primary jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission which currently has before it a Petition requesting a declaratory ruling on the same issues raised in this Complaint. FCC Docket WC-06-129, *In the matter of Petition of Image Access, Inc. d/b/a NewPhone for Declaratory Ruling Regarding Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Promotions Available for Resale Under the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended, and Sections 51.601 et seq. of the Commission's Rules* (the "FCC Resale Docket").

20. In the alternative, Respondent asks that this Complaint be held in abeyance pending the outcome of two federal lawsuits. One is pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, *Budget PrePay, Inc. v. AT&T Inc. f/k/a SBC Communications, Inc.*, Case Nos. 09-11188 and 09-11099. Oral argument scheduled for March 1, 2010. The other is pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, *CGM, LLC v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-00377.

### **COUNTERCLAIMS**

21. For its own retail customers, AT&T offers to waive the line connection charge, a one-time payment of about \$40. AT&T, however, refuses to give Respondent the full value of that \$40 credit, offering instead only about \$32 (the value of the retail credit less the wholesale discount). The reseller is entitled to receive the full value of the line connection waiver.

Here is a simple example, based on the assumption that the wholesale discount is 20%: When a reseller orders a new line, he pays AT&T a wholesale rate of \$32 for the line connection fee (the tariffed rate of \$40 less the 20% wholesale discount.) If AT&T waives the line connection charges for its retail customer, AT&T will give the reseller a credit of \$32 (\$40 credit less the wholesale discount). Since the \$32 charge to be reseller is offset by the \$32 credit, the

reseller is charged \$0 for the line connection. If, as Respondent claims, AT&T is required to give the reseller the full, \$40 value of the waiver, the reseller would end up with a credit of \$8 instead of \$0 (the \$40 credit less the \$32 charge). Respondent asks the Commission to declare that AT&T cannot impose this condition on resale unless and until AT&T "proves to the state commission that the restriction is reasonable and nondiscriminatory." 47 C.F.R. § 51.613(b).

22. AT&T offers discounted telephone service bundled with other, non-regulated services such as cable television and internet services. AT&T, however, refuses to offer its telephone services for resale at a comparable discounted rate. Respondent asks the Commission to declare that AT&T cannot impose this condition on resale unless and until AT&T "proves to the state commission that the restriction is reasonable and nondiscriminatory." 47 C.F.R. § 51.613(b).

23. AT&T has recently informed Respondent that AT&T intends to reduce from approximately \$40 to \$4.66 the amount paid to resellers under AT&T's "\$50 cash back" rebate offer. Respondent asks the Commission to declare that AT&T cannot impose this condition on resale unless and until AT&T "proves to the state commission that the restriction is reasonable and nondiscriminatory." 47 C.F.R. § 51.613(b).

### **RELIEF SOUGHT**

WHEREFORE, Respondent respectfully requests that the Commission issue an Order

1. Denying the relief sought by AT&T;
2. Dismissing this Complaint in deference to the primary jurisdiction of the FCC or, in the alternative, holding this Complaint in abeyance pending the outcome of two federal lawsuits addressing the same issues raised in this Complaint;

3. Granting Respondent's Counter Claims and such further relief as the Commission deems fair and equitable.



John J. Pringle, Jr., Esquire  
Ellis, Lawhorne & Sims, P.A.  
1501 Main Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 2285  
Columbia, South Carolina 29202  
Telephone: (803) 343-1270  
Facsimile: (803) 799-8479  
[jpringle@ellislawhorne.com](mailto:jpringle@ellislawhorne.com)

Henry M. Walker, Esquire  
Bradley Arant Boult Cummings, LLP  
1600 Division St., Suite 700  
Nashville Tennessee 37203  
Telephone: (615) 252-2363  
Facsimile: (615) 252-6363  
[hwalker@babco.com](mailto:hwalker@babco.com)

Attorneys for Affordable Phone Services, Inc.,  
d/b/a High Tech Communications

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2010-14-C

IN RE:

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T  
South Carolina, Complainant, Petitioner  
v. Affordable Phone Services, Inc. d/b/a  
High Tech Communications,  
Defendant/Respondent

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that I have caused to be served this day, one (1) copy of the **Answer and Counterclaims of Affordable Phone Services, Inc. d/b/a High Tech Communications** by placing a copy of same in the care and custody of the United States Postal Service (unless otherwise specified), with proper first-class postage affixed hereto and addressed as follows:

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL SERVICE**

C. Lessie Hammonds, Esquire  
Office of Regulatory Staff  
Legal Department  
PO Box 11263  
Columbia SC 29211

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL SERVICE**

Patrick W. Turner, Esquire  
**BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.**  
1600 Williams Street  
Suite 5200  
Columbia SC 29201



Carol Roof  
Paralegal

February 25, 2010  
Columbia, South Carolina